CRANSTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

SEPTEMBER 15, 2014

WESTERN HILLS MIDDLE SCHOOL

400 PHENIX AVENUE, CRANSTON, RI 02920

EXECUTIVE SESSION – 6:00 P.M.

IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING - PUBLIC SESSION

AGENDA

1. Call to order- 6:00 p.m. Convene to Executive Session pursuant to RI State Laws -

2. PL 42-46-5(a)(1) Personnel:

3. PL 42-46-5(a)(2) Collective Bargaining/Litigation:

A. Contract Negotiations' Update(s)=

B. (Secretaries)

C. (Teachers)

D. (Teacher Assistants)

E. (Bus Drivers, Mechanics)

F. (Tradespeople)

4. PL 42-46-5(3)

A. District Safety Plan

5. P.L. 42-46-5(8);

A. Deliberations re: Student "A" Permit Appeal Hearing held on 9/10/14

6. Executive Session

7. Call to Order - Public Session

8. Roll Call – Quorum

9. Executive Session Minutes Sealed – September 15, 2014

10. Minutes of Previous Meetings Approved – August 13, 2014 (Student Hearing), August 13, 2014 (Work Session) and August 18, 2014 (Regular School Committee Meeting)

11. Public Acknowledgements/Communications

12. Chairperson's Communications

13. Superintendent's Communications

14. School Committee Member Communications

15. Public Hearing

 a. Students (Agenda/Non-Agenda Matters)

 b. Members of the Public (Agenda Matters Only)

16. Consent Calendar/Consent Agenda

17. Action Calendar/Action Agenda

RESOLUTIONS

ADMINISTRATION

No. 09-14-04 RESOLVED, to Accept or reject decision of Assistant Superintendent re: Student "A" Permit Appeal

PERSONNEL

No. 09-14-05 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent the following certified personnel be appointed for the 2014-2015 school year:

Jared Monteiro, Step 1

Education…URI, BS

Experience…Pawtucket School Department

Certification….Secondary Math

Assignment…Western Hills .4 FTE

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 12911810 51110

David Boyajian, Step 5

Education…RIC, BS

Experience…West Warwick School Department

Certification….Technology Education K-12

Assignment…Cranston West 1.0 FTE

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 12612360 51110

Jane Correra, Step 3 + B+36

Education…PC, BS.

Experience…Cranston Substitute

Certification….Secondary English

Assignment…Cranston East .6 FTE

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 11312340 51110

Ian Smith, Step 10

Education…URI, BS

Experience…Warwick School Department

Certification….Secondary English

Assignment…Cranston East 1.0 FTE

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 11312340 51110

Marissa Walker, Step 3

Education…Wheelock College, BA

Experience…Cranston Substitute

Certification…. Elementary 1-6

Assignment…CSR .5 FTE

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 12012050 51110

Jessica Morales. Step 3

Education…URI, BA

Experience…Providence School Department

Certification…Secondary Math

Assignment…Cranston West .6FTE

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note…12612280 51110

Deborah Bessette, Step 12 + Masters

Education…RIC, BS, URI MA

Experience…Cranston Substitute

Certification….Reading K-12

Assignment…Itinerant .5 FTE (privateparochial)

Effective date…August 25, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 12412050 51110

Susan Mastrati, Step 12 +MA

Education…RIC, BA, MA

Experience…Cranston Retiree

Certification…Reading

Assignment…CACTC .5 FTE

Effective date…September 15, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note…51974125 51110

Debra Favicchio, Step 12 +B+36

Education…RIC, BS

Experience…Cranston Retiree

Certification…Secondary Math

Assignment…CACTC .5 FTE

Effective date… September 15, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note…51974131 51110

Elizabeth Ruest, Step 12+ MA

Education…RIC, BA RIC MA

Experience…Cranston School Retiree

Certification….Reading K-12

Assignment…Norwood .3 FTE

Effective date…September 15, 2014

Authorization…Replacement

Fiscal Note… 13813200 51110

No. 09-14-06 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the

following certified personnel be appointed as substitutes on a temporary basis as needed:

Katie Chamberlain, MiddleElementary

Lynn Tatewosian, Early Childhood PK-2

Macie Marchetti, BiologyScience

Thomas Heston, Elementary

Shana Girouard, Special Education ElementaryMiddle

Jennifer Nachba, Elementary

Stephanie Goetz, General Subject Matter

No. 09-14-07 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the resignation(s) of the following certified personnel be accepted:

Janet Reardon, Nurse-Teacher

Stone Hill

Effective date…August 19, 2014

Amy Chapman, Teacher

Itinerant

Effective date…August 21, 2014

Janice Devitt, Teacher

Eden Park

Effective date…August 12, 2014

Richard Perrotta, Teacher

Cranston West

Effective date…September 12, 2014

Laurence Birmingham, Assistant Principal

Bain

Effective date…October 1, 2014

No. 09-14-08 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the
following individual(s) be appointed as an athletic coach:

Jeffrey Robert, Assistant Coach Girls' Volleyball

CHSE

Step-6

Class-C

Playing Competition-High School

Experience-Assistant Coach Bay View Academy

Certification-RI Coaches Certification; CPRAEDFirst Aid

Carl Bishop, Assistant Coach Girls' Tennis

CHSE

Step-6

Class-D

Playing Competition-None

Experience-Head Coach tennis

Certification-RI Coaches Certification; CPRAEDFirst Aid

No. 09-14-09 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the resignation of the following coach (es) be accepted:

Ashley Pagliarini, Head Coach Girls' Co-op Hockey

Cranston WestCranston East

Effective date…August 21, 2014

Dina Cesana, Head Coach Girls' Indoor Track

Cranston East

Effective date…August 29, 2014

Richard Perrotta, Head Coach Girls' Basketball Boys' Tennis

Cranston WestCranston East

Effective date…September 11, 2014

No. 09-14-10 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the

Superintendent, the following individuals be appointed as volunteer coaches:

Richard Grenier, Jr., Boys' Soccer

Cranston High School East

No. 09-14-11 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following non-certified employee(s) be appointed:

Laura Ceballos, Teacher Assistant

Orchard Farms

Effective date…August 26, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note… 13646100 51110

Lorraine French, Teacher Assistant

Orchard Farms

Effective date…August 26, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note…13646100 51110

Jennifer Scappaticci, Teacher Assistant

Western Hills

Effective date…August 26, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note…12646020 51110

Nikki Notarianni, 3hr Teacher Assistant

Waterman

Effective date…August 26, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note 11046010 51110

Michelle Bergantino, Secretary

Arlington

Effective date…September 8, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note….12543210 51110

Katherine Lucchetti, Bus Monitor

Transportation

Effective date…August 26, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note… 10345090 51110

Dianne Broxson, Bus Monitor

Transportation

Effective date…August 26, 2014

Replacement

Fiscal Note…13445090 51110

Nancy Rudacevsky, 3HR Teacher Assistant

Gladstone

Effective date…September 4, 2014

New

Fiscal Note…11946010 51110

No. 09-14-12 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following non-certified personnel be appointed as substitutes on a temporary basis as needed:

Emmanuel Suggs, Custodian

Nathan Stone, Custodian

Nicole DiDino, Secretary

Nicole Brousseau Rustici, Secretary

Helen Akinlapa, Teacher Assistant

No. 09-14-13 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the resignation(s) of the following non-certified personnel be accepted:

Nikki Notarianni, Bus Monitor

Transportation

Effective Date…August 22, 2014

Shelia Testa, Teacher Assistant

Stone Hill

Effective Date…August 27, 2014

Juan Cartagena, Custodian

Plant

Effective Date…August 6, 2014

BUSINESS

PURCHASED AND PURCHASED SERVICES

No. 09-04-14 Resolved that the following purchases be approved:

Lumber in the amount of $5,379.62

Number of bids issued   5
Number of bids received   3

Custodial Paper Supplies in the amount of $67,756 for 2014-2015 and $68,316 for 2015-2016 based on a two year bid (actual quantities to be adjusted based on needs and funds available)

Number of bids issued   6
   Number of bids received   3

Lease / purchase of 15 small buses at a cost of $44,452 per bus. Financing of the vehicles shall be no greater than a fixed interest rate of 1.879% per annum over a five year term.   Final financial lender to be determined.

Number of bids issued   3
   Number of bids received   3

POLICY AND PROGRAM

No. 09-14-15 RESOLVED, that the following New Construction: 7000 series- to be deleted or amended for second reading (see C.P.S. for old policies)

#7000   General Policy statement-   Amend

#7100   New Construction- Planning - delete. Amend to read "For pertinent legal information, refer to: General Laws of R.I., 16-2-15."

#7110 (a)(b) Determining Needs - delete. Amend to read "For pertinent legal information, refer to: General Laws of R.I., 16-9-4 through 16-9-8."

#7111 Projecting Educational Programs - delete. Amend to read "For pertinent legal information, refer to: General Laws of R.I., 16-9-4 through 16-9-8."

#7113 Evaluating Existing Buildings   Delete

#7114 Determining Extent of New Construction   Delete

#7115 Developing Educational Specifications   Delete

#7120 Patterns of Participation   Delete

#7121 Involving the Staff   Delete

#7122 Involving the Public   Delete

#7123 Using Educational Consultants   Delete

#7130 Relations with the Public   Delete

#7140 Relations with other Governmental Units   Delete

#7142 Relations with the State   Delete

#7210 Site Development - delete and amend to read "For pertinent legal information, refer to General Laws of R.I., 16-2-25."

#7211 Selection of Site   Delete

#7212 Land Use   Delete

#7213 Landscaping   Delete

#7220 Building Design   Delete

#7230 Equipment and Furniture   Delete

#7300 Occupying   Delete

#7310 Training the Staff   Delete

#7320 Inspection of Completed Project   Delete

#7330 Acceptance of Completed Project Delete

#7411 Bonded Indebtedness - Amend to read: Refer to General Laws of R.I., 16-60-4.9iv.

#7550 Dedication of a Project – Amend to add "Tot Parks"

#7551 Naming the Building   Delete

No. 09-14-16 BE IT RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the following Conferences/Field Trips of Long Duration be authorized:

1. Thomas Barbieri, Principal at Cranston High School West, to travel to Orlando, Florida from January 20, 2105 – January 23, 2015 to attend 2015 FETC Conference. Travel and accommodation expenses to be funded by the Perkins Grant. Please see attached conference and registration form.

2. Gerald Auth, Director of the Cranston Area Career & Technical Center at Cranston High School West, to travel to Orlando, Florida from January 20, 2105 – January 23, 2015 to attend 2015 FETC Conference. Travel and accommodation expenses to be funded by the Perkins Grant. Please see attached conference and registration form.

3. The Cranston High School West and SkillsUSA Rhode Island will be will be traveling to Washington, DC, by van departing September 19,

2014 and returning September 24, 2014. The purpose of the trip is for students to learn about government issues and meet with RI elected officials to discuss reallocation of Perkins funding as it pertains to CACTC. There are eight students attending, accompanied by three chaperones. Group will be staying at the Hilton Washington Dulles, 13869 Park Center Rd, Herndon, VA. Each individual attending will be responsible for financing his/her trip and providing chaperones with insurance cards prior to trip.

No. 09-14-17 RESOLVED, that at the recommendation of the Superintendent, the Revised Cranston Public Schools Evaluation Handbook and Policy Agreement for Educators and Non-classroom/Related Service Providers be approved for first reading (see policy attached).

18. Public Hearing on Non-Agenda Items

19. Announcement of Future Meeting(s) – October 8, 2014 and October 20, 2014
20. Adjournment

School Committee members who are unable to attend this meeting are asked to notify the Chairperson in advance.

Interested persons and the public at large, upon advance notice, will be given a fair opportunity to be heard at said meeting on the items

proposed on the agenda.

Individuals requesting interpreter services for the hearing impaired must notify the Superintendent's Office at 270-8170 72 hours in advance of hearing date.

Any changes in the agenda pursuant to RIGL 42-46-6(e) will be posted on the school district's website at www.cpsed.net, Cranston Public Schools' administration building, 845 Park Ave., Cranston, RI; and Cranston City Hall, 845 Park Ave., Cranston, RI and will be electronically filed with the Secretary of State at least forty-eight hours (48) in advance of the meeting.

Notice posted: September 12, 2014

Cranston Public Schools

Evaluation Handbook and Policy Agreement

For Educators and

Non-Classroom/Related Service Providers

September 2014

Equal Opportunity Employer:

Cranston Public Schools is committed to maintaining a work and learning environment free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, pregnancy, gender identity, sexual orientation, marital/civil union status, ancestry, place of birth, age, citizenship status, veteran status, political affiliation, genetic information or disability, as defined and required by state and federal laws. Additionally, we prohibit retaliation against individuals who oppose such discrimination and harassment or who participate in an equal opportunity investigation.

Title II & Title IX Coordinator of Employment 504 Coordinator

Raymond L. Votto Jr.   Joseph Rotz

Chief Operating Officer   Executive Director of Educational Programs

School Committee Members

Andrea M. Iannazzi, Esq., Chairman

Trent Colford

Stephanie Culhane

Jeffrey Gale

Paula McFarland

Janice Ruggieri

Michael A. Traficante

Cranston Public Schools Administration

Judith Lundsten, Superintendent

Jeannine Nota-Masse, Asst. Superintendent

Joe Balducci, Chief Financial Officer

Raymond Votto, Chief Operating Officer

Joseph Rotz, Executive Director of Education Programs and Services

Michele Simpson, Executive Director of Pupil Personnel Services

James Dillon, Executive Director of Student Information Services & Data Management

Cranston Teachers' Alliance

Lizbeth A. Larkin, President

John A. Santangelo, Jr., Vice President

Kathleen A. Torregrossa, Secretary

Amy S. Misbin, Treasurer

Evaluation Design Team

Thomas Barbieri,

Frank Flynn

Lizbeth Larkin

Peter Nero

Kathleen Torregrossa

District Evaluation Committee (DEC)

The DEC serves as a governing body to support the educator evaluation system. It is representative body comprised of central office administrators, building administrators, a program supervisor, and educators. Selection is determined through Central Administration and the Cranston Teachers' Alliance (CTA). The following five members of the DEC are selected by the Superintendent or designee: central office administrator, Human Resources representative, high school administrator, middle school administrator, and elementary school administrator. The following five members are selected by the CTA President or designee: program supervisor, high school educator, middle school educator, elementary school educator, and CTA Executive Board Member. Additionally, the Educator Evaluation Coordinator serves on this committee as the Committee Chairperson. Each committee member serves a two-year term. All representatives of the DEC complete

evaluator training, with the exception of the representative from Human Resources.

DEC Members

Kathleen Torregrossa- Chairperson, Evaluation Coordinator

Joseph Rotz – Executive Director of Educational Programs and Services

John Santangelo – Vice President, Cranston Teachers' Alliance

Raymond Votto – Chief Operating Officer

Michael Crudale - Principal, Park View Middle School

Darcy Mollo – Sp. Ed. Teacher, Park View Middle School

James Zanfini, Principal, Oaklawn

Jodi Murphy – Guidance, Cranston High School East

Joseph Potemri - Assistant Principal, Cranston High School East

David Regine – Program Supervisor

Matthew Sheridan – Elementary Teacher, Arlington

A Message From:

Lizbeth Larkin

President, Cranston Teachers' Alliance

The Cranston Teachers' Alliance played a vital role in the development and design of the new teacher evaluation process. It is the union's position that all teachers who are to be reviewed have the appropriate professional development to understand the format and, therefore, be better able to participate in the process.

It is also imperative that all administrators have the appropriate training so they can effectively evaluate and support their staff. The Alliance supports all efforts to make the teacher evaluation a meaningful experience for all concerned. It is important to note that this initiative was accomplished through a labor management agreement between the Cranston Teachers' Alliance and the administration of the Cranston Public Schools. We are grateful for the financial and professional support we have received from the American Federation of Teachers' Innovation Grants and the continued professional support from the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers and Health Professionals. The union will be available to assist the district to insure the success of this evaluation process.

Lizbeth A. Larkin, President
Cranston Teachers' Alliance
American Federation of Teachers, Local 1704

A Message From

Dr. Judith A. Lundsten

Superintendent, Cranston Public Schools

Developing an effective, fair and accurate evaluation system for teachers and administrators is hard work. Cranston Public Schools in collaboration with the Cranston Teachers' Alliance has worked collaboratively to develop such a system. We appreciate the support of additional resources provided through the I3 grant to be part of this important work in developing a system where teachers and administrators receive feedback, have time for reflection and be involved in professional conversations that strengthen their practices. The effort to improve teaching and learning through a new teacher evaluation system has pushed us to think about our policies, and practices and will provide us with data to help shape professional development and other initiatives. Supporting teachers and administrators is a priority as well as support student achievement. We look forward to continuing this demanding work with the Cranston Teachers' Alliance.

Judith A. Lundsten, Ed.D.

Superintendent

Cranston Public Schools

Table of Contents

`

History/Rationale/Purpose

Over a decade ago, Cranston Public Schools (CPS) recognized a need to redesign the evaluation process for educators. That new model, based on work by Charlotte Danielson, addressed the need to have a better, more accurate picture of what constitutes good teaching practice in order to serve two purposes – to both inform and guide educators on improving their practice through focused professional development, and to see that improvement in practice translated into improved student achievement. While that system was successful for the time in which it was implemented, more current research on educator evaluation, as well as the current political climate, have illuminated the need to record and review multiple measures of a educator's practice in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of effective practice in a world that is rapidly changing.

In 2009, Cranston was invited to join a consortium with five other districts (Central Falls, Pawtucket, Providence, West Warwick, and Woonsocket) to develop a high quality educator evaluation and support system. The RIIC, Rhode Island Innovation Consortium, was formed. In May of 2010, an educator contract was approved for Cranston that included the creation of a new educator evaluation system. The eventual model is fully aligned with the RI Educator Evaluation System Standards and the RI Professional Teaching Standards, and adapted from Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2007).

The RI Innovation Initiative on Educator Evaluation was a collaborative effort led by the RI Federation of Educators and Health Professionals, the districts' superintendents and union presidents. Administrative and union teams worked side by side, along with national experts to create a research based system that is focused on professional growth, based on multiple measures of evidence, and provides meaningful feedback and to support continuous improvement in professional practice.

In 2011, the RIIC model was approved for gradual implementation. Over the course of the 2011-2012 school year the model underwent a rigorous restructuring, based on feedback from all constituents involved that year. In May of 2012, a new, redesigned RIIC model gained approval from the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) for full implementation in the fall of 2012. In August of 2013,

the educator rubric was revised and a rubric for related service providers was approved for pilot implementation. In July of 2014, the RI Legislature approved a new cyclical model, which is reflected in this document.

The Innovation Evaluation and Support System is focused on educator growth and student achievement. It relies on multiple measures of educator effectiveness, including impact on student growth and achievement. Educator effectiveness will be rated on the following domains:

• **Planning & Preparation (Standard 1)**

• **The Classroom Environment (Standard 2)**

• **Instruction (Standard 3)**

• **Professional Growth & Responsibilities (Standard 4)**

• **Student Growth Measures (RIDE's SLOs/SOOs)**

The following processes frame the system:

• **Goal setting and reflection**

• **Formal observations and unannounced observations by highly trained evaluators**

• **Review of additional evidence of effectiveness**

• **RIDE's student growth measures**

• **High quality, timely feedback**

• **Personalized professional development plans**

• **Intensive support with timelines for improvement for personnel identified as ineffective or developing**

Educator Evaluation Components

In accordance with Article XVIII and any and all relevant sections of the collective bargaining agreement (Appendix E), all educators will be required to participate in the differentiated evaluation process. All non-tenured educators and educators new to the Cranston Public Schools will be evaluated on an annual basis for three consecutive years. All other educators will be placed in a differentiated cycle for evaluation based on their rating. A teaching year shall consist of a minimum of 135 days worked.

The Cranston Public Schools will have certified evaluators. In order to ensure this, the Cranston Public Schools and the Cranston Teachers' Alliance agree to collaborate in the provision of initial evaluator training and continuous support.

Prior to the end of September, Human Resources will provide each building principal a list of faculty members. The building principal is then required to notify educators, in writing of their official evaluation status for that academic year. This will serve as the educator's official notification of the pending evaluation.

In the event that an educator should obtain an overall rating of Developing or Ineffective, an Intervention Plan will be created by the evaluator with the educator. Human Resources will coordinate the District Educator Intervention Plan.

Any teacher who has a Professional Practice rating of Developing on the formal teacher evaluation instrument may not participate in the Teacher Assignment Process.

Any teacher who has a Professional Practice rating of Ineffective on the formal teacher evaluation instrument may not participate in the Teacher Assignment Process.

Educator Evaluation Schedule

Month Effective & Highly Effective – Not in Formal Year

Effective &

Highly Effective

Formal Year

Non Tenured Educators, Using New Certification, Ineffective, &

Developing

RSPs   Evaluators

September &

October

1st Self Assessment

Design 1 PGG

Review Student Data

Design two SLOs

 1st Self Assessment

Design 1 PGG

Review Student Data

Design two SLOs Steps here are determined based on the differentiated cycle that they are placed in.

RSPs do not have to do a lesson plan, however, if they normally teach lessons and choose to do a lesson plan and are in their formal year, they certainly may submit a lesson plan for an observation. Review & Approve PGGs

Review &

Approve SLOs

for those teachers in a formal evaluation year.

November & December

Suggested

1 Unannounced Observation

Suggested

2 Unannounced

Observations

  Suggested

Observe all Non tenured twice

Observe 1/3 Tenured

January & February .

Review goals with Evaluator if necessary. Enter mid year data only if adjusting SLO/PGG. Suggested

Formal Observation, write Reflection

Review goals with Evaluator and enter mid year data if adjusting SLO/PGG. Suggested

Observe Non Tenured once,

Observe 1/3 Tenured & complete all Formal Observation

Review educator's goals

March & April   Suggested

1 additional

Observation

  Complete all observations

May Prepare for & participate in Summative Conference 2nd Self Assessment, prior to Summative Conference

Prepare for & participate in Summative Conference 2nd Self Assessment, prior to Summative Conference

Prepare for & participate in Summative Conference Prepare for &

participate in Summative Conference Prepare and hold summative conferences.

*EVALUATORS should submit observation feedback to educator within 12 school days following the observation.

Educator Self Assessment & Reflection
(Formal Evaluation Year)

Educators will begin each school year by rating themselves on the CPS Professional Practice Rubric prior to designing that year's Professional Growth Goal (PGG). Again, prior to the summative conference, educators will rate their practice. In addition, either after a formal or unannounced observation, educators will review the evidence, write a brief reflection, and can rerate themselves on those targeted areas should they choose. Over the course of a school year, educators may discover patterns and note areas of increasing strength as well as continuing areas for growth.

Purpose: Review for patterns of practice, note areas of strength and growth

Types:
1. Rubric Rating
2. Evidence Reflection

Commence:

1. Prior to designing PGG

2. After evidence from a formal or unannounced observation

3. End of the year, before the summative conference

Process/Number of times per school year:

1. Minimum of two times, prior to developing the yearly PGG and again later in the school year, in preparation for the summative conference and rating.

2. A reflection is completed in Aspen after either a formal lesson or an unannounced observation (during a formal year) once the evidence in the evidence collection template has been reviewed.

Participant(s): Educator

Materials Needed:

1. CPS Professional Practice Rubric

2. Reflection template in Aspen

Outcome(s): Direct professional growth plan

Professional Growth Goals (PGGs)

(Formal Evaluation Year Only)

These targeted goals shape every educator's professional development for the school year and are to be developed only during an educator's formal evaluation year. They are developed after self-assessment on the CPS Professional Practice Rubric and after reflection of the prior year's ratings. This will form a clear understanding of individual areas of strength and for growth.

Purpose: Continual, personalized, targeted, documented professional growth

Commence: Start of each school year or after educator self-assessment of practice

Process/Number of Times per school year: Design, receive evaluator approval at start of year, review progress throughout the school year through the action plan, and they may be modified (with approval of Evaluator) at mid year.

Participants: Educator, Evaluator

Materials Needed: CPS Professional Practice, PGG Template

Conclusion: PGG is rated within the CPS Professional Practice, 4.4b and 4.4c, at the conclusion of the school year, with evidence provided

by educator prior to the summative conference.

Student Learning Objectives (SLO's)

(Mandated by RIDE)

(Formal Evaluation Year Only)

SLOs are long-term academic goals, set by educators for groups of students, are based on student data, and are to be developed only during an educator's formal evaluation year. They should represent important concepts in learning, must be measurable by valid and reliable assessments, and can be either progress or mastery based.

Purpose: Continual, targeted, documented student growth

Types: Reading, writing, math, or content specific

Commence: Start of school year (October), after a review of student data

Process/Number of times per school year: Design, receive evaluator approval at the start of school year, review throughout the school year and progress through academic plan, and may be revised (with approval of Evaluator) as appropriate at midyear, with supportive evidence to provide rationale for the adjustment. Revisions are based on the RIDE guidelines.

Participants: Educator, evaluator, students

Materials Needed: Student Data on specific assessment criteria, SLO template in Aspen, RIDE approval and rating process

Conclusion: SLOs are rated using the RIDE SLO attainment process, at the end of the school year, with evidence provided by the educator, in advance of the summative conference.

Conferences

There are five types of conferences: goal setting, midyear, pre and post observation, and summative. ONE conference is required for all educators every year: the summative. Non-tenured educators, those new to the district, those using a new certification, Developing, and Ineffective educators will also have a mid-year conference. While summative conferences must be conducted, in person, between each educator and their evaluator, goal setting and mid year review conferences may be conducted with small groups of educators, when appropriate (for example, by grade level, department, or program). End of year conferences, for educators in their formal year, require the collection, analysis, and continuous review of data, Educator Self-Assessment and Reflection data and Student Assessment data. End of year conferences, for those educators not in their formal year, will be reflective in nature and will be between the evaluators and educators.

The pre-observation and post-observation conferences occur surrounding a lesson plan and are only required during a formal observation year.

Goal Setting Conference – Optional

This beginning of the school year meeting between an educator and their evaluator solidifies both an educator's PGG, as well as their SLOs.

Purpose: During the goal setting conference, the educator and evaluator should review the data used to set both the Professional Growth Goal and two Student Learning Objectives, determine the appropriateness of the goals, and complete the approval process.

Commence: Start of School Year

Process/Number of times per school year: The Educator reviews the data and goals are submitted to the Evaluator for approval. The Evaluator should use the PGG Approval Rubric to complete that process and RIDE guidance to approve SLOs. The data that supports the attainment of goals should be continuously reviewed throughout the year. Goals can be revised as needed, in collaboration between the educator and the evaluator, but no later than mid year.

Participants: Educator, Evaluator

Materials Needed: PGG and/or SLO Materials

Conclusion: Implement action plans for goals once approval has been granted

Pre-Observation Conference (only necessary when submitting a lesson plan)

The pre-observation conference is used by the evaluator to clarify specific elements of an educator's lesson plan prior to an observation.

Purpose: Conducted prior to a formal observation, this conference gives the educator an opportunity to respond to any questions about the lesson the evaluator may have.

Commence: This conference will take place prior to the observation.

Process/Number of times per school year: The first step is for the evaluator to request a lesson plan from the educator and set a preliminary pre-observation conference and observation date. The educator then designs and submits the lesson plan to the evaluator and peer evaluator (if appropriate). The lesson plan is reviewed, and the educator and evaluator(s) meet to discuss the upcoming lesson. This process should occur prior to each formal observation.

Participants: Educator, evaluator, peer evaluator (as appropriate)

Materials Needed: Lesson plan

Conclusion: Confirm observation date and time

Post Observation Conference

During a post observation conference, the educator and evaluator have an opportunity to review and discuss what was observed during an educator's lesson.   These professional conversations should provide additional insight into an educator's continually evolving professional practice.

Purpose: Research suggests that positive, productive, timely feedback is essential to establishing a culture of change for educators.   Professional conversations between an educator and evaluator should serve as a catalyst for ongoing professional growth.

Commence: After each formal observation, after the educator has reviewed the recorded evidence, and written a reflection, which in turn is reviewed by the evaluator.

Process/Number of times per school year: Once a formal observation has occurred, the evidence has been reviewed and the educator has written a reflection, the post observation conference will take place. This conference should be both holistic in nature with respect to an educator's practice and targeted to specific areas of both professional strengths and areas for growth. Individual components and elements for the CPS Professional Practice should be used as a basis for this conversation, which should take place at the

culmination of each formal observation cycle.

Participants: Educator, evaluator, peer evaluator (as appropriate)

Materials Needed: Evidence collection template, CPS Professional Practice rubric, reflection template, student work (as appropriate)

Conclusion: Discuss next steps towards professional growth

Mid Year Review Conference – Optional for Highly Effective & Effective unless Educator is adjusting the SLO/SOO/PGG (based on data) and only done during a formal evaluation year.

A mid year review conference provides an opportunity to collect and analyze data on PGGs, SLOs, and an educator's professional practice.   Agreed upon modifications can then be made to goals and/or teaching practice.

Purpose: This conference serves as a mid-year check on an educator's PGG and SLOs and allows for agreed upon modifications to be made if necessary. These modifications must have the approval of an educator's evaluator(s). Mid Year Review conferences may be conducted with small groups of educators, when appropriate (for example, by grade level, department, or program).

Commence: Mid-year

Process/Number of times per school year: It is essential that the data for both PGGs and SLOs, be continuously reviewed by the educator. The mid-year conference is the last opportunity to make changes to an educator's goals. In writing, using the Mid-Year Revision/Review template in Aspen, educators may communicate a request for revision and must provide supporting documentation to the evaluator by the last day of the second quarter. If approved, then the revision process must be completed, in collaboration between the educator and evaluator, by the Friday before February break. In addition, educators may request feedback on their professional practice using the Mid-Year Revision/Review template.

Participants: Educator, evaluator, peer evaluator (as appropriate)

Materials Needed: Data, PGG and SLO templates

Conclusion: Goals are reviewed and modifications are made as needed

Summative Conference: All educators, every year.

For an educator in a formal year, the end-of-year summative conference provides the opportunity to review an educator's

evidence of goal attainment, as well as a cumulative view of professional practice, which leads to a final educator effectiveness rating for that school year.

For an educator not in a formal evaluation year, the end of year summative conference will be reflective in nature and will be between the evaluators and educators.

Purpose: The summative conference is a professional conversation that serves a number of purposes. While the educator and the evaluator review and discuss the various components that lead to a educator's final cumulative effectiveness rating, it also should provide guidance to the educator regarding their progress over the year, areas that indicate growth as well as a blueprint for the design of next year's PGG for continued professional development.

Commence: End-of-year (April to June).

Process/Number of times per school year: Evaluators should begin to collect evidence of effectiveness and the attainment of goals in April. All student data on the assessments selected must be completed by the end of the first full week of May. Summative conferences can be scheduled with educators. Evaluators should establish a summative conference schedule. Educators should have at least five school days to prepare materials for submission to their evaluators. Evaluators should have at least five school days to

review and rate an educator's evidence in advance of the summative conference date. This once-a-year conference completes the educator evaluation process for the school year.

Participants: Educator, evaluator, peer evaluator (as appropriate)

Materials: All materials, data, evidence related to educator evaluation, final summative rating sheet

Conclusion: This conversation should end with an educator and their evaluator's comprehensive understanding of the educator's current level of effectiveness, areas of strength and growth, and considerations for next year's PGG.

Observations

There are three types of observations. At least one observation is required for all educators in their formal evaluation year. At least three observations are required for non-tenured educators, those who are using a different certification, and those who have been rated as developing or ineffective.

Principals may observe a teacher's classroom and classroom instruction at any time; however, formal scripted evidence is only collected during a formal evaluation year. Evaluators may take notes during unannounced observations that occur during a non-formal

evaluation year.

Formal Observation

This is the most comprehensive type of observation, and is required for educators in their formal observation year, non-tenured educators, those who have been rated as either developing or ineffective, and those who are now using a different teaching certification. (Minimum 30 minutes)

Sequence of events:
 Lesson plan
 Pre-observation conference
 Observation
 Evidence feedback
 Self reflection (and rating)*
 Post conference

Purpose: This type of observation provides a complete picture of an educator's preparation, implementation, performance, and reflection on a specific lesson.

Commence: At least once a year for non-tenured educator and those rated as either developing or ineffective, educators who have changed certifications or are in their formal observation year. Both the educator and their evaluator agree upon the observation time.

Process/Number of times per year: The formal observation cycle should begin and conclude within twelve school days. The evaluator requests a lesson plan from the educator, then reviews and aligns the evidence prior to the pre-observation conference. During this conference, the evaluator has the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and the educator can provide additional information about the lesson. Within the next one or two school days, the observation occurs.

The Evaluator then aligns the evidence, which is reviewed by the educator prior to writing their reflection. The reflection evidence is also added to the evidence collection template in preparation of the post observation conference. During this conference the educator and evaluator review the lesson holistically as well as on focused areas.

Formal observation cycles occur at least once a year for non-tenured educators and those rated as either developing or ineffective, once for those educators who have changed certifications or are in their formal observation year.

Participants: Educator, evaluator, peer evaluator (as appropriate)

Materials: Lesson plan, evidence collections template, reflection template, CPS Professional Practice Rubric rating sheet

Conclusion: Collection of evidence is provided to an educator at the end of the cycle.

Unannounced Observation (During Formal Evaluation Year)

During an unannounced observation, the evaluator collects evidence to be shared with the educator. These observations are more informal in nature yet help to provide evaluators with a more comprehensive view of an educator's daily practice. Every educator should have a minimum of one unannounced observations per year. Non-tenured educators, those who have been rated as either developing or ineffective, and those who are now using a different teaching certification should have a minimum of two unannounced observations. These observations may be 10 to 20 minutes in duration.

Sequence of Events:
 Observation
 Evidence Feedback
 Self Reflection (and Rating)*

Purpose: Although this is an unannounced observation and does not include a lesson plan, a pre-observation or post observation

conference; there is an additional opportunity for the evaluator to collect instructive evidence on a educator's practice and for the educator to then review that evidence in order to grow professionally.

Process/ Number of times per school year: The unannounced observation cycle should begin and conclude within twelve school days. The evaluator visits the classroom and collects evidence of a educator's practice. The evaluator then aligns that evidence, which is reviewed by the educator. If educators chose to write a reflection to this observation, this evidence is also added to the evidence collection template.

Commence: Unannounced observation cycles occur at least twice a year for all educators.

Participants: Educator, Evaluator, Peer Evaluator (as appropriate)

Materials: Evidence collection template

Conclusion: Collection of evidence is provided to an educator at the end of the cycle.

Yearly Effectiveness Ratings

At the end-of-the-year conference, the evaluator will provide the educator with their summative Professional Practice/Growth & Responsibilities rating (PPGR). The following ranges will be used to determine level of effectiveness.

Scoring Key for CPS Professional Practice Effectiveness Ratings:

   HE= Highly Effective   (3.5 - 4.0)

   E= Effective   (2.5 – 3.49)

   D= Developing   (1.5 – 2.49)

   I= Ineffective   (1.49 or less)

The CPS Professional Practice Rubric is the vehicle for scoring an educator's Professional Practice, Growth and Responsibilities. The PPGR rating will be combined with the Student Learning Rating (SLR) to determine the overall effectiveness rating. The SLR is a combination of the Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Attainment

Score and, where appropriate, the Student Growth Score. Once the SLR has been determined and shared with the educator, the SLR and the PPGR will be plotted into the matrix to determine the Final Effectiveness Rating.

Scoring Individual Student Learning Objectives

Sample SLO:

Objective: Students will improve their expository writing in response to informational text, including a clear thesis statement and the inclusion of appropriate textual evidence.

Assessment: District writing prompt assessment (administered quarterly)

Targets: (The following example is based on a 4 point rubric with 60 students, adjust if you use another rubric)

Of my population of 60 students across two classes:

-The 6 students who scored a 4 on the Q1 assessment will maintain their achievement level through Q4.
-The 20 students who scored a 3 on the Q1 assessment will improve by at least 1 level by Q4.
-The 34 students who scored a 1 or 2 on the Q1 assessment will improve by at least 2 levels by Q4.

You could opt to write a goal with 4 or more tiers depending on your student population.

Step 1: Scoring Individual SLOs Examples

Exceeded

This category applies when all or almost all students met the target(s) and many students exceeded the target(s). For example, exceeding the target(s) by a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students would not qualify an SLO for this category. This category should only be selected when a substantial number of students surpassed the overall level of attainment established by the target(s).

Criteria: 85% or more of the students met the target and 35% of the those students exceeded the target = Exceeded

In the example below, with 60 students, for a teacher to achieve Exceeded, at least 51 students (85%) must meet the target and of those 51, 18 (35%) must exceed the target.

Sample Data:
-6 out of 6 students who scored a 4 on the Q1 assessment maintained their achievement level through Q4, thus meeting the target.
-20/20 students who scored a 3 on Q1 assessment improved by at least 1 level by Q4, meeting their target. 16 of the 20 students improved by at least 2 levels, exceeding their target.
-33/34 students who scored a 1 or 2 on Q1 assessment improved by at least 2 levels by Q4, meeting their target and 7 of the 34 students

improved by at least 3 levels, exceeding their target. 1 student only gained one level.

All but one student met the target. In addition, 59 out 60 met their target with 23 out of those 59 students exceeding their targets. This can be considered a "substantial" improvement.

Met

This category applies when all or almost all students met the target(s). The bar for this category should be high and it should only be selected when it is clear that the students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s).

Criteria: 75% - 84% (45-51) or more of the students met the target = Met

Sample Data:
5/6 students who scored a 4 on the Q1 assessment maintained their achievement level through Q4.
•15/20 students who scored a 3 on Q1 assessment improved by at least 1 level by Q4. 5 of the 20 students improved by 2 levels.
•32/34 students who scored a 1 or 2 on Q1 assessment improved by at least 2 levels by Q4. 3 of the 34 students improved by 3 levels.

Most students met their targets. 8/60 students exceeded their targets

(not 35%). Only 3/60 students did not meet their targets.

Nearly Met

This category applies when many students met the target(s), but the target(s) was missed by more than a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students. This category should be selected when it is clear that students fell just short of the level of attainment established by the target(s).

Criteria: 65%-74% (39-44) of students met the target = Nearly Met

SAMPLE DATA

-3/6 students who scored a 4 on the Q1 assessment maintained their achievement level through Q4.

-14/20 students who scored a 3 on Q1 assessment improved by at least 1 level by Q4.

-26/34 students who scored a 1 or 2 on Q1 assessment improved by at least 2 levels by Q4. 2 of the 34 students improved by 3 levels.

Each of the targets were missed by more than a few students with only 44/60 students meeting the targets. However, 2 students exceeded their targets.

Not Met

This category applies when the results do not fit the description of what it means to have "Nearly Met". If a substantial proportion of students did not meet the target(s)the SLO was not met. This category also applies when results are missing, incomplete, or unreliable.

Criteria: